February 8, 1941, by Lockwood Laboratories from Hammond, Ind.; and charging that it was misbranded.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement of active ingredients, the directions for use, and the warning appearing upon the label were not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness as to render them likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use, since the statement "Chester A. Lockwood" diagonally written across these statements tended to obscure them.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label failed to bear adequate directions for use, since they did not provide for a limit as to duration or frequency of administration.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the label failed to bear adequate warnings against use in those pathological conditions where its use might be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or methods or duration of administration, in such manner and form, as were necessary for the protection of users, since there was no warning that the frequent or continued use of acetanilid might be dangerous, causing serious blood disturbances, anemia, collapse, or a dependence on the drug, and that frequent or continued use of bromides might lead to mental derangement, skin eruptions, or other serious effects. (The preparation, when taken according to directions, would permit the administration of 6.84 grains of acetanilid daily.)

The article was alleged to be misbranded further in that it was dangerous to health when used in the dosage, or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling thereof, namely: "Dose: a heaping teaspoonful in half glass of water; if not relieved repeat after interval of four hours, not to exceed three doses in twenty-four hours."

On April 3, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

431. Misbranding of Casey's Compound. U. S. v. 329 Bottles of Casey's Compound. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 4004. Sample No. 60029-E.)

On March 29, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Oregon filed a libel against the above-named product at Portland, Oreg., alleging that it had been shipped on or about February 12, 1941, by the Geo. E. Madison Co. from San Francisco, Calif.; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that it contained potassium iodide (19.8 grains per fluid ounce) in a flavored syrup.

The article was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that it would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage and with the frequency and duration prescribed, recommended, and suggested in the labeling. (2) In that the label failed to bear adequate directions for use since the directions (bottle and carton) "One-half teaspoonful in half a glass of water, one hour after each meal for four days; then gradually increase to one full teaspoonful over 4 days time and continue the dose of one teaspoonful. This is the usual dose but may be increased to double the amount," were not adequate. (3) In that its labeling failed to bear adequate warnings against use where its use might be dangerous to health or against unsafe dosage or duration of administration in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users. (4) In that statements in a leaflet entitled "Casey's Compound," supplied in response to a request by postcard enclosed in the retail package, representing that it would be efficacious for the relief of arthritis, neuritis, rheumatism, and sciatica; and that its use would make the purchaser's general health much better, and enable him to enjoy a good night's rest, were false and misleading since it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

On June 4, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

432. Misbranding of Cold Special No. 2 Red. U. S. v. 1 Bottle and 18 Bottles of Cold Special Capsules (and 2 other seizures of Cold Special Capsules). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 3873 to 3875, incl. Sample No. 50059-E.)

On February 26, 1941, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia filed libels against 1 bottle containing 2,800 Cold Special Capsules, 1 bottle containing 25 capsules, and 65 bottles containing 12 capsules at Washington, D. C., alleging that they were being offered for sale in the District of Columbia—1 large bottle and 18 small bottles at Albany Pharmacy, 1 large bottle

and 16 small bottles at the Southern Drug Co., and 81 small bottles at National Press Pharmacy; and charging that they were misbranded. The articles were labeled in part: "Capsules Cold Special * * * [or "Cold Special * * * Each Capsule Contains:"] * * * Dose: One capsule every hour as required [or "Directions One Capsule every 2 or 3 hours * * * Notice—Acetanilid is a dangerous drug, over dosage may cause depression of the heart or circulatory system" or "Dosage Adults: 1 capsule every hour until 4 or 5 have been taken, then 1 capsule every three hours as required * * * Acetanilid preparation may depress the heart and should not be taken continuously except under the direction of a physician"]."

Analysis of a sample of the article showed that each capsule contained acetanilid (approximately 2 grains), quinine sulfate (approximately ½ grain), camphor, podophyllin, and aloin.

The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that it would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage or with the frequency and duration prescribed, recommended, and suggested in the labeling; (2) in that the labeling failed to bear adequate directions for use since the directions appearing thereon were inappropriate for an article of the composition of this one; (3) in that the labeling failed to bear an adequate warning against use in those pathological conditions and by children where its use might be dangerous to health, or against unsafe dosage or duration of administration in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users; and (4) in that the designation "Cold Special," appearing on the labeling, was false and misleading since the article did not constitute a treatment or preventive for the disease condition commonly known as "cold."

On May 20, 1941, no claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

433. Misbranding of Halomist Sets and Refills. U. S. v. 89 Packages of Halomist Sets and 100 Bottles of Halomist (and 1 other seizure of Halomist and Halomist Refills). Default decrees ordering destruction of the products. (F. D. C. Nos. 4347, 4872. Sample Nos. 53047-E, 53048-E, 58037-E, 58038-E.)

This product, in addition to being potentially dangerous when used according to directions, bore false and misleading therapeutic claims in its labeling and also failed to comply with certain other labeling provisions of the law.

On May 27 and June 6, 1941, the United States attorneys for the Southern District of California and the District of Minnesota filed libels against 89 packages (each package containing an applicator, medicine dropper, and a bottle of Halomist) and 100 bottles of Halomist at Los Angeles, Calif., and 11 Halomist Sets, 27 1-ounce and 4 half-ounce Halomist Refills at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped by Halomist, Inc., from Seattle, Wash., within the period from on or about March 19 to on or about April 21, 1941; and charging that it was misbranded.

Analyses of samples showed that the Halomist consisted essentially of racemic epinephrine hydrochloride (in one sample, 2.3 grams, in the other, 2.4 grams per 100 cubic centimeters), chlorobutanol, and water.

The article was alleged to be misbranded: (1) In that it would be dangerous to health when used in the dosage or with the frequency or duration prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the labeling, which recommended that it be used at least 3 times daily—with inhalations of 15 to 35 minutes' duration and in extreme cases, of 45 minutes' to 2 hours' duration. (2) In that statements in the labeling that it would be efficacious for the relief of paroxysms of bronchial asthma, for treatment of hay fever or sinusitis; that it would be efficacious to prevent asthma attacks, to build up natural resistance and strength and to build up weight; that the user would be able to eat what he pleased; that it would be soothing to the membranes; that it contained an ideal antiseptic for the sinuses; that it would build up resistance against sinus disorders and catarrhal conditions; and that it would toughen the tissues against infection and irritation, were false and misleading since it was neither a safe nor an appropriate treatment for the conditions named. (3) In that the carton containing the set did not bear the common or usual names of the active ingredients nor a statement of the quantity or proportion of chlorobutanol present. (4) In that the name and address of the manufacturer was not prominently placed on the carton with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read by the ordinary individual under cus-